IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE ON
NEIGHBOURHOOD SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES

REFER FILE

Nov 20 9 01 AM 84

November 19, 1984

To: Neighbourhoods Committee

Origin: Implementation Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services

Subject: Final Report - Implementation Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services (FINALREPORT:13)

METROPOLITAN TORONTO CENTRAL LIBRARY Main Adult Reference

CONTENTS

1. Contents
2. Implementation Task Force Members
3. Preface
4. Acknowledgements
6. Summary
7. *RECOMMENDATIONS*
9. Community Task Force Recommendations Review
19. Community Centre - Evaluation and Review
29. Implementation Task Force Mandate Review
33. Annotated Appendix

IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE MEMBERS

ROGER HOLLANDER, Chairman
519 Church Street Community Centre

PAUL ZARNKE
St. Christopher House

BERT PIRK
Parks and Recreation Department

DAVID MILLAR
Parks and Recreation Department

ERIC BURTON
Boys and Girls Club of Downtown Toronto

LUIS CARRILLO-MOLINA
Centre for Spanish Speaking Peoples

ALEJANDRA CUNSILLE
Working Women Community Centre

LEE DAVIES
Association of Advisory Councils

JOHN GLADKI
Planning and Development Department

CAROL JONES-SIMMONS
Bloor Information and Legal Services

ROB KANTER - Alderman

BERT KINGSLEY
Management Services Department

CONNIE LAMANNA
Association of Advisory Councils

GREG McCLARE
Toronto Board of Education

FRANCO SAVOIA
Y.M.C.A. of Metropolitan Toronto

GERRY STOKES
Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board

DAVID REVILLE - Alderman

PREFACE

The work of the Implementation Task Force follows several years of progressive activity by the City of Toronto and community agencies in developing new policy and new approaches to services in the social and recreational fields.

Our most immediate predecessor was the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services. It was this Task Force that developed the mandate and set the course for our implementation undertakings of this past eighteen months.

Because of the excellent co-operation of City Departments and community agencies, we have been able to complete the work in about half the time originally projected. This, of course, does not mean that there is not more to do. It is, however, the opinion of the members of the Implementation Task Force that the on-going endeavours do not require a structure such as a task force.

We believe that the policies created, the strategies tested and the co-operation generated are sufficient, at this time, to serve the people of Toronto well in effectively and economically meeting identified needs and realistically responding to emerging challenges.

The acknowledgements that follow attempt to recognize the individuals, departments, organizations and groups that have contributed to the success of the Implementation Task Force. Nevertheless, I personally would like to acknowledge the support of my board and the patience of my staff at the 519 Church Street Community Centre in allowing me the amount of time and energy that has been required to serve as Chairman of the Task Force. I have found the experience a gratifying, though exhausting one, and I hope, as I am sure all the members of the Task Force do, that our work will be of lasting value to the people of Toronto.

Roger Hollander

Roger Hollander
Chairman

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It was recognized as a necessity and promoted as a principle that maximum effectiveness depended upon maximum participation of community agencies and City Departments. The Implementation Task Force has been fortunate in benefitting from the contribution of persons throughout the City Hall and the community agencies. Beyond the participation on the committees listed below, there are the many individuals in the City Departments of Property, Parks and Recreation, Planning and Development, Management Services, City Auditor, City Clerk, City Solicitor, Housing, Labour Relations and Finance and in TANS and AOCC agencies that gave generously of their time to assist in specific projects. We are extremely grateful to all of them in the many small and large ways that they not only assisted in the work but also through their willing response generated the positive feelings so essential in this process.

Executive Committee - Roger Hollander, Chairman, 519 Church Street Community Centre; Paul Zarnke, St. Christopher House; Herb Pirk and David Millar, City Department of Parks and Recreation.

Ralph Thornton Community Centre Committee - Greg McClare, Chairman, Toronto Board of Education; Leigh Bowman, City Department of Parks and Recreation; Keith Fielding, Management Services Department; Jim Mackay, Property Department; and Harriet Simmons, Planning and Development Department.

1347 Davenport Community Centre - Paul Zarnke, Chairman, St. Christopher House; Keith Fielding, Management Services; Doris Haist, Parks and Recreation; Jim Mackay, Property; and Vince Pietropaolo, Planning and Development.

St. Lawrence Community Centre Committee - Lee Davies, Chairman, Association of Advisory Councils; Bill Furgeson, Joanne McPherson and Linda Lapointe of the St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association; Brian Bee, St. Lawrence Day Care Association; Joe D'Abramo, Planning and Development; David Millar, Parks and Recreation; Wilfrid Worland, Housing; and Richard Wiatr, Property.

Funding Committee - Eric Burton, Chairman, Downtown Toronto Boys and Girls Club; Roger Hollander and Penny Lamy, 519 Church Street Community Centre; Luis Carillo-Molina, Centre for Spanish Speaking Peoples, Alejandra Cumsille, Working Women's Community Centre; Brian Smith, Woodgreen Community Centre; Bob Doyle, Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto; Ted Garrard, United Community Fund of Metropolitan Toronto; Nello Del Rizzo, Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto; Doris Haist and Pat O'Connell, Parks and Recreation; and Bert Kingsley, Dorothy Rusoff, Edna Lampton and Chris Leschuk, Management Services.

Objective Setting, Reporting and Evaluation - Jim Ward, Chairman, Dixon Hall; Lin Grist, Centre 55; Elaine Goldy and John McFadden, Parks and Recreation; and Bert Kingsley, Management Services.

Toronto West Project - Ed Kothiringer, Chairman, Planning and Development; Teresa Cogliano and Lyn Shinn, Parks and Recreation; Mina Dhar and Larry King, Planning and Development; and Colin McAdam, St. Christopher House.

Directory of City Services - Charlotte Empey, Chairman, City Clerk; Jim Boduch and Doris Haist, Parks and Recreation; Laura Heggie, City Clerk; Roger Hollander, 519 Church Street Community Centre; and Paul Zarnke, St. Christopher House.

Community Data Base - John Gladki, Chairman, Planning and Development; Herb Pirk, Pat O'Connell, Ron Foster, Bruce Bryson, Doris Haist, Jim Boduch and David Millar, Parks and Recreation; and Ed Kothiringer, Steve Dynes, Simon Chamberlain, Harriet Simmons and Ed Mihalcin, Planning and Development.

The annotated appendix at the end of this report contains a description of the reports produced by these committees.

Neighbourhoods Committee

November 19, 1984

SUMMARY

The Implementation Task Force began its work in the fall of 1982. Its membership consisted of nine representatives from community agencies, three from City Departments and two Aldermen. The community agency members were increased to ten with an addition of another person from the Association of Advisory Councils. During the course of its eighteen months there were two replacements, one community agency and one City Department. It met on approximately once a month basis. All meetings were open to the public, at some, deputations were heard. There were two sources of the work of the Implementation Task Force: the recommendations of the Community Task Force on Social and Recreational Services approved by Council in July of 1982 and direct referrals from Neighbourhoods Committee of Council, the Budget Review Group and City Executive.

The recommendations of the Community Task Force covered the following categories: City roles in recreation and community services; City funding policy, long-term planning, program planning and co-ordination, management and accountability, provision of information; and implementation, monitoring and development.

Comprehensive policy was approved re-enforcing the City's commitment to recreation and community services. There was an extensive review of funding policy and practices. Demographic data, methods for ascertaining community preferences and principles and procedures for program evaluation were prepared for City Departments and community agencies. Short term improvements and long-term commitments were made in regard to the provision of information. Advisory Councils were established in all City recreation centres. A comprehensive community planning study was undertaken in the west end of the City. Evaluation and review studies were undertaken in regard to five existing community centres and one proposed centre.

A variety of approaches have been tested during the course of the work. It is clear that, regardless of the specifics of any one approach, a broad range of involvement of City Departments and community residents, agencies and organizations stands the best chance of arriving at satisfactory solutions to community issues.

Half-way through its three year projected term the members of the Implementation Task Force decided to disband on the basis that most of the work undertaken had been completed and that future needs could be met by existing structures through the spirit of understanding and co-operation that had been created by the various task forces during the past several years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That this report be received as the final report of the Implementation Task Force.

2. Since the inter-departmental/community ad hoc committees such as those set up by the Implementation Task Force for issues related to the Ralph Thornton Centre and the St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Community Centre have proved to be a successful approach in assisting the City Council decision making process;

It is therefore recommended that the practice of using inter-departmental/community ad hoc committees, reporting to Neighbourhoods Committee, be continued for the resolution of community and social service issues brought before the Neighbourhoods Committee of Council.

3. Since representatives of TANS, AOCC and the Association of Recreation Centre Advisory Councils have played an active part in the above process and are, as a result, experienced in the effective use of this approach; and since the participation of a variety of City Departments has provided balance in the information gathering essential to this process;

It is therefore recommended that community representation be invited on such ad hoc committees which should include representatives from TANS, AOCC and the Association of Recreation Centre Advisory Councils; that appropriate City Departments also serve on the ad hoc committees.

4. Since the principle of community participation is now well established,

It is therefore recommended that, where appropriate, representation be expanded to include such groups as INTERACT and OCASI.

5. Since the use of community chair persons has proved to be an effective method of enhancing community participation;

It is therefore recommended that the ad hoc committees be chaired by community persons selected by the Neighbourhoods Committee.

Recommendations Cont'd.

6. Since the ad hoc committees developed by the Implementation Task Force utilized various staffing arrangements including:

a) Staff seconded by City departments;

b) Agency staff retained via a grant to the agency to offset the salary costs; and

c) Independently hired staff;

It is therefore recommended that future ad hoc committees be staffed using one of these three models and that where b) or c) is chosen as the appropriate staffing model that the City make funds available for this purpose.

7. Now that the Sesquicentennial celebrations are drawing to a close and the need for the City Directory of Services remains unmet;

It is therefore recommended that the City Clerk's Department report on the plan for publishing a Directory of Services in accordance with the original recommendations of the Task Force as approved by Council in July of 1982 and that funds required for implementation of these recommendations be included in the 1985 proposed operating budget of the City Clerk's Department.

COMMUNITY TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION REVIEW

The recommendations of the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services approved by City Council July 8 and 9, 1982 were grouped into the following categories: City Roles - Recreation and Community Services; City Funding Policy; Long-Term Planning; Program Planning and Co-ordination; Management and Accountability; and Provision of Information.

The Implementation Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services, the successor to the Community Task Force, began its work in the fall of 1982 by reviewing the recommendations and assigning responsibility to various City Departments, community organizations and committees to do the base work in fulfilling the intent of each recommendation. The following is a summary of the work accomplished in this way by the Implementation Task Force in regard to the specific recommendations of the Community Task Force. The recommendations themselves are presented in the indented format followed in each case, in open format, by the action taken in regard to the recommendation.

CITY ROLES

RECREATION

1. The City shall directly provide and manage through the Department of Parks and Recreation a range of basic recreation facilities and programs free of charge to City residents, continue to utilized shared-use agreements under local boards of education and financially assist or otherwise support the provision of recreation programs offered by voluntary organizations, agencies and community centres so as to ensure that all citizens have maximum opportunity for the enjoyable, satisfying are creative use of leisure time.

Action

Accepted as City policy.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

2. The City shall facilitate and support the provision of community services to as wide a range of Toronto residents as possible and it shall undertake to support such services where need has been demonstrated through such means as:

a. The use of space in City-owned buildings.

b. The promotion of sharing of non-financial resources and expertise among agencies, e.g., jointly sponsored research projects, sharing of equipment for special events, access to staff development and training programs, etc.

c. The provision of administrative and technical support to local agencies.

d. The advocacy of financial support from community and government funding bodies.

e. The provisison of core administrative funding of multi-purpose community centres established by City By-law and managed by local boards of management.

f. The support and/or undertaking of needs and resources studies at the neighbourhood level.

g. The provision of direct financial support through general grants where community service needs have been clearly identified and other sources of support are not available.

h. The amendment of current priorities for the use of City operated recreation facilities according to Appendix "E" so as to permit the provision of community services by external organizations at these locations.

i. The provision of other forms of support as deemed appropriate by Council.

Action

Points a. e. and h. have been accepted and are operative.

Points b. c. and f. have begun and are in the process of evolving into standard practices.

Point d. was considered by the Implementation Task Force Funding Committee and was seen as not being necessary inasmuch as several other public and private bodies are providing this service.

Point 6. is in practice in terms of the current work of the Grant Review Board.

CITY FUNDING POLICY

1. The City provide grants through the Department of Parks and Recreation to Voluntary agencies, organizations and community centres for the provision of designated recreation programs according to the policies and procedures as set out in Appendix "C".

Action

Currently accepted practice.

2. For the fiscal year 1983, on-going recreational programs provided by community agencies which had been supported by recreational grants from the Grant Review Board in excess of $10,000 in 1982 shall be financed through Departmental Grants, and the evaluation and reporting process will commence for fiscal year 1984.

Action

1983 has turned out to be the transition year with all agencies receiving recreation grants over $10,000 categorized as Major Recreation Agencies. The process is in place for these grants to be administered through the Parks and Recreation Department in the 1984 fiscal year.

3. The Grant Review Board continue to provide specific Recreation Grants under the current policies and procedures as revised and contained in appendix "D" where the amount granted is less that $10,000 and to recommend where programs should be funded through departmental grants.

Action

This practice is currently in place.

4. The 1983 program change requests fo the Grant Review Board include:

   a. An amount to adjust the base budgets of currently funded recreation programs in order to match the level of support with demonstrated financial need and that at

least $35,000 be included for this purpose.

b. An inflationary adjustment to the 1982 budget.

c. An amount to permit the funding of new programs.

d. These amounts be developed by the Grant Review Board in consultation with the Department of Parks and Recreation and the Implementation Task Force.

Action

This work was completed through a combination of meetings, consultations and deputations among the Grants Review Board members, the Executive of the Implementation Task Force and grant-receiving agencies.

5. The City should continue to expect that other funding bodies accept responsibility for the adequate funding of social and community service programs for which they have had an historic involvement or provision for the support of such programs.

Action

This point was made clear through the work of the Funding Committee of the Implementation Task Force. This committee included representation from the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, the United Way of Greater Toronto, the Metropolitan Toronto Social Planning Council and community agencies.

6. Representatives of the Implementation Task Force, the Department of Management Services and the Grant Review Board be requested to initiate discussions with the Metropolitan Department of Community Services and any other funding bodies deemed appropriate to determine more appropriate funding responsibilities particularly with respect to the City's provision of General Grants for Social and Community Service programs and prepare a progress report for Council Consideration by December 1, 1982.

Action

This work was undertaken through the Funding Committee of the Implementation Task Force (the representation on which is included above). This committee on two occasions held joint meetings with the Grant Review Board. It was determined that the major criterion differentiating Metro from City grants is the social service(Metro)/recreation(City) distinction. It was recognized that there are community programs that are potentially funded by both the City and Metro. However, it was decided that a change in criteria would not be as effective or feasible as continued and on-going communication between Metro and the City in regard to those programs that fall into this category.

7. The Implementation Task Force in consultation with community agencies prepare appropriate revisions to the current policies and procedures for City Grants in light of the discussion referred to in recommendation no. 6.

Action

The decision of the Funding Committee, in consultation with the Grant Review Board, was that revisions were not required at this time.

8. Any proposed changes to funding criteria of the City and other funding bodies be subject to public consultation and the adequate funding of those programs affected.

Action

There were no funding criteria changes.

9. The proposed community centre policy guidelines contained in Appendix "E" be adopted.

Action

These were adopted.

10. The amount provided in the 1983 budget for the funding of community centres include the $50,247 required to augment existing staff levels as noted in section 3 of section XI of this report and the specific allocations of this amount be subject to approval of the 1983 Program Change phase of the Budget.

Action

Approximately two-thirds of this amount was so allocated.

LONG-TERM PLANNING

1. The Department of Planning and Development in conjunction with the Department of Parks and Recreation develop a comprehensive data base on facilities, programs and needs which will include:

   a. An inventory of recreational facilities.

   b. Comprehensive community profiles for the neighbourhoods served by current recreational and community service facilities.

   c. Attendance rates for existing programs and facilities.

   d. Information on identified community preferences for particular resources.

Action

Work has been undertaken in all these areas. Community profiles are available to community agencies. The facilities inventory has been completed and the community preference manual is near completion.

2. The Department of Planning and Development, in co-operation with the Department of Parks and Recreation utilize the comprehensive data base mentioned in recommendation no. 1 to undertake a study of the distribution of current recreation and community service needs, identify future needs and demands for these services and investigate procedures for projecting long term capital requirements.

Action

This work is in progress.

3. The Department of Parks and Recreation take the lead role in setting objectives and priorities for the distribution or appropriate redistribution of recreational facilities and program following the completion of the study and this should be

undertaken in a way that provides for consultation opportunities for the public and service agencies.

Action

This process has been accepted.

4. The procedures as contained in Appendix "F" be adopted for use in assessing proposals for new facility development.

Action

These procedures have been accepted and are being utilized.

5. An inter-agency working group composed of representatives of the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Department of Planning and Development and the agencies providing recreation and community services in the area bordered by Lakeshore Boulevard, University avenue, Bloor Street and Dufferin Street be established to develop a model for co-ordinating the provision of services.

This working group was established and includes the above representation. It is referred to as the Toronto West Project and is now in the second phase of the work.

Staff of twenty agencies were interviewed; information was gathered on another thirteen agencies; residents were consulted; elected officials polled and presentations made to four home and school associations; and a profile of the area was developed using census data and planning maps.

Feed back sessions were held with a group consisting of residents, agency staff and elected officials. As a result of these sessions the following action plans were put in place: a "travelling road show" on area services and facilities; in-depth study of the needs of seniors; and development of a "service forum" designed as an information exchange.

As of the end of April 1984: three agencies are co-operating in attempting to develop a comprehensive approach to seniors' issues in the area - a request has been made to the Grant Review Board in this regard; a successful community forum has taken place involving community organizations and agencies; the travelling roadshow has four requests for its production; the beginnings of an over-all network are emerging; and an evaluation of the project approach is underway.

PROGRAM PLANNING AND CO-ORDINATION

1. City operated recreation centres, City-funded community centres and agencies receiving grants through the Department of Parks and Recreation be expected to annually demonstrate the relationship of programs offered to the comprehensive recreation data base and that the department of planning and development provide assistance to such centres in the use of this information.

Action

This process is evolving and will take some time to build into the established practices of the above agencies. It is clear that there are resources within the Parks and Recreation and Planning and Development Departments to assist agenies in meeting these expectations.

2. The Department of Parks and Recreation establish citizen advisory councils in all of its permanent recreation centres by September 1983.

Action

Not only has this been accomplished but also the Council of Advisory Councils has been organized to serve as a support base and information exchange for the individual councils.

3. The Department of Parks and Recreation undertake pilot projects to examine ways of improving its outreach capabilities, particulary with regard to the use of facilities by ethnic minorities.

Action

The intent of this recommendation is included in the role assigned to the advisory councils.

4. The Department of Parks and Recreation provide a reception capability at one ot its recreation facilities on a two-year pilot project basis and evaluate the extent that this increases utilization and improves access to program information of the centre and general city-wide services and that $11,500 be approved in principle and the Department include this amount in the 1983 Program Change requests for this purpose.

Action

This was given high priority by the Department of Parks and Recreation but was turned down by the Budget Review Group.

5. All City-funded agencies be required to report on the extent to which their programs are designed to serve ethnic minorities within the neighbourhoods they serve.

Action

This work was to be implemented in conjunction with the Mayor's Committee on Race Relations. Although a reporting process has not as yet been developed it is the intent that the manual currently being prepared by the Department of Planning and Development will assist agencies in reaching out to all groups within their catchment areas.

MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

1. City-funded community centres adopt a set of constitutional provisions and procedures for the selection and operation of boards of management consistent with the guidelines set out in Appendix "E" by January 1, 1983.

Action

The implementation of this recommendation has been left to individual agencies and AOCC.

2. The Department of Parks and Recreation present for Council consideration a proposed policy on the roles and responsibilities of advisory councils by April 30, 1983.

Action

Drafts of this document have been circulated for discussion.

3. City-operated recreation centres and City-funded community centres be responsible for developing a statement of centre level objectives and objectives for major program areas for fiscal year 1984. These objectives shall be for a one year period and shall be sufficiently specific and measurable to permit a determination of the extent to which they are achieved.

Action

The Report of the Objective Setting, Reporting and Evaluation Committee of the Implementation Task Force provides guidelines for agencies and the City in regard to meeting the intent of this recommendation.

4. The Implementation Task Force and the Department of Management Services develop a plan and priorities by December 1, 1982 for the provision of technical services and expertise to assist in the process described in recommendation no. 3.

Action

This work was undertaken through the above committee.

5. The Department of Parks and Recreation and the Association of Community Centres develop formats for the annual reporting of concise program information for each facility by September 1983.

Action

The Objective Setting, Evaluation and Reporting Committee Report presents an outline for achieving the goal of this recommendation.

PROVISION OF INFORMATION

Action

The seven recommendations in this section are related to the development of a City Directory of Services. Several committee meetings were convened and a critical path developed for the publishing of the Directory. There is however a delay in regard to the planning for the Sesquicentennial celebrations. Apparently the City is publishing a comprehensive directory for this event and it was decided that it would be redundant and too expensive at this time to publish the directory recommended by the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services. It is anticipated that there will be about a year delay in the time line for this directory. In the meantime the Department of Parks and Recreation has made significant improvements in its directories, including the insertion of programs of community agencies, in preparation for the anticipated publication of the larger City Directory in 1985.

Neighbourhoods Committee

November 19, 1984

COMMUNITY CENTRES - EVALUATION AND REVIEW

FOUR APPROACHES

The Implementation Task Force has been active directly or indirectly in evaluation, organization, planning and review work related to six different community centres - the Ralph Thornton Community Centre, the 1347 Davenport Community Centre, the St. Lawrence Community Centre, the Applegrove Community Complex, the Scadding Court Community Centre and the Cowan Avenue Fire Hall Community Centre.

There have been four different approaches in working with these centres:

1. Neighbourhoods Committee initiated evaluation and review with direct referral to the Implementation Task Force - Ralph Thornton, 1347 Davenport and St. Lawrence;

2. By-law initiated evaluation and review - Applegrove;

3. Community initiated evaluation and review - Scadding Court; and

4. Community and City Department initiated evaluation and review - Cowan Avenue.

Neighbourhoods Committee Initiated

The procedure followed in the first category was as follows: referral to the Implementation Task Force from the Neighbourhoods Committee; establishment by the Task Force of a committee consisting of representatives of the City Departments of Parks and Recreation, Planning and Development, Property and Management Services and a community representative from the Task Force as chairman; a report prepared consisting of contributions from the individual departments, interviews with representatives from the community and committee deliberations; consideration of the report by the Task Force; and submission of a report so approved to the Neighbourhoods Committee. The Task Force itself did not depute to the Neighbourhoods Committee but acted as an expert resource to the Committee.

The [illegible] procedure forms the broad outline of the first approach; however, there are individual differences related to the specifics of each of the three centre situations:

1. The Ralph Thornton Community Centre - this process has taken over a year. It has included deputations by the

Ralph Thornton Committee of Management to the Implementation Task Force and the Neighbourhoods Committee. Upon approval by the Neighbourhoods Committee of the amended Task Force recommendations, the Task Force has remained active on a technical committee chaired by Alderman Reville. This technical committee was set up to implement the recommendations approved by Neighbourhoods and subsequently by Council. Its membership includes representatives of the City Departments of Management Services, Parks and Recreation, Planning and Development, Property and City Auditor; representation from the Management Committee of the Ralph Thornton Centre and the Implementation Task Foorce; and the two Ward 7 Aldermen. The Task Force contribution has included consultation on personnel, budget, organization and process.

2. 1347 Davenport Community Centre - This committee was constituted similarly to that of the Ralph Thornton. It followed the procedure as outlined. Its work was completed in one month and included four meetings of the committee, reports from each department represented on the committee and a meeting with community representatives. The recommendations of the Implementation Task Force were not accepted by Council. The matter was referred to the Department of Planning and Development and apparently during the past year a final decision has not as yet been made in regard to the 1347 Davenport facility.

3. The ST. Lawrence Community Centre - The difference between this committee and the two previously described is that it includes direct representation from a neighbourhood association; in this case, the St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association. It is also different inasmuch as the St. Lawrence Community Centre does not as yet exist; the task, therefore, being more a planning one than a remedial one. In this case it is also the first time that City Housing has been included on a committee created by the Implementation Task Force and Management Services has not. The report preparation follows the process previously outlined.

By-Law Initiated

The second category, By-law directed involvement, as it was used in the Applegrove case, has Council set the committee membership. In the By-law for Applegrove the membership of the evaluation committee is Management Services, the Centre Head of the Armstrong Recreation Centre, the Director of the Applegrove Complex and the Co-ordinator of the Implementation Task Force. The committee is

chaired by Management Services and reports to Council through the Neighbourhoods Committee.

The process involves the following: the framework of the evaluation set by the committee with primary input from the two agency members of the committee; preliminary data collection including past reports and documents, current status of program, finance and organization; consultation with representatives from City Departments, the school system and members of City Council; the preparation of a base report upon which to evaluate the progress of the Applegrove Complex over time; the potential expansion of the committee to include broader community and City Department representation; and preparation of comparative quarterly reports over a period of one year. The co-ordination and report writing is undertaken by the chairman, the Management Services representative. The contribution of the Task Force staff has been primarily related to data collection and process consultation.

Community Initiated

The third category, community initiated evaluation and review, was introduced by the Chairman and Past Chairman of the Implementation Task Force to assist a community agency, Scadding Court Community Centre, in overcoming difficulties without involving structures outside of the community.

Paul Zarnke and Roger Hollander offered their services to the Management Committee of Scadding Court. They were accepted by the Committee and undertook an extensive interview process with agency staff, board and community members. The Task Force staff prepared a review of documents and the drafted the report under the direction of Paul and Roger. Most of the recommendations of the report were accepted by the Scadding Court Committee. These recommendations, similar to the recommendations in reports prepared under the auspices of the Implementation Task Force, related to personnel, finance, program, organization, management and community relations.

Community and City Department Initiated

The fourth category, community and City Department initiated involvement, was developed by St. Christopher House and the Department of Parks and Recreation in regard to the Cowan Avenue Fire Hall Community Centre. In this instance City Council rescinded the Cowan Avenue By-law and directed Parks and Recreation to work toward resolving the difficulties at the community centre. Parks and Recreation assigned staff to run programs at the Centre and contracted with St. Christopher House to undertake the community organization necessary to create a

community board capable of managing the Centre. The funds previously committed to Cowan Avenue were sufficient to pay for these resources. Within six months a new community management committee was elected by the community and confirmed by Council, a new By-law drafted and approved and a co-ordinator hired. It believed that the co-operative atmosphere and goodwill engendered by the Community Task Force and maintained by its successor, the Implementation Task Force, was the significant factor in the success of the Cowan experience.

Overview

The above work has all been completed within the past eighteen months. At Ralph Thornton a new board has been appointed and a new executive director hired; there is, nevertheless, still much that needs to be done including community relations, board development and user group relations and development. Although 1347 Davenport has been off the Implementation Task Force agenda for a year, the issue is still not resolved. The St. Lawrence report has been accepted by the Neighbourhoods Committee of Council. For all intents and purposes, the work with Applegrove has just begun with the imminent publication of the first report. Scadding Court is relatively settled with the appointment of a new Director and the improvement in the financial reporting and management systems; but significant tasks remain in the areas of board development, program and community relations. Cowan Avenue has come a long way and has an impressive list of accomplishments since its reorganization in the Spring of 1983.

Basic Principles

It is obviously too early to evaluate the impact or fully understand the dynamics of the various approaches to evaluation and review presented here. It would seem, nevertheless, that there are some principles that appear to be emerging that might be useful as policy guidelines for the City and these are:

1. The value of a broad base of participation of community residents and agencies, Council and City Departments in working co-operatively to solve emerging problems; and

2. The value of independent staff to co-ordinate the process development, recording and reporting requirements of any one project. The above work has drawn such staff resources from Parks and Recreation, Management Services, St. Christopher House and the Implementation Task Force.

EXPECTATIONS AND OPERATIONS

From the current experience with the five existing centres and one proposed centre, it is clear that the difficulties experienced are complex. Although each centre has a unique identity, history and community, there are some common themes concerning the nature and source of problems; and these can be examined in two broad categories - expectations and operations.

Expectations

1. Cost

Most of these centres were developed through the Neighbourhood Improvement Program with most of the developmental costs being covered by other levels of government. It appears that City approval in several cases was obtained on the basis that the centres would cost the City virtually nothing - developmental cost being covered through NIP and operating costs through the ability of centres to raise their own money. In the case of Ralph Thornton, documents were prepared that assured Council that not only would Ralph Thornton not cost anything, it would in fact save the City money through two of its Departments locating site offices there "rent free". As the centres have evolved the City has committed itself to pay for the administrative costs and the range is between sixty and two hundred thousand for each centre. Regardless of how economical a centre might run, the fact that for some members of Council and City officials the starting point was "no cost" frequently places centres in a defensive position before the Budget Review Group. As a result, the relationship between City and centre, from time to time, ressembles more an advocacy one than a co-operative one and leaves the impression on the part of the centres that the City does not value their work. The fact that these centres have attracted thousands of dollars in grants from the federal and provincial governments and raised general funds through rentals, fund raising events and programs seems at times to be missed because of the expectation of "no cost".

2. Self-Image

Another influential expectation relates to the self-image of the centres. There is a strong philosophical belief, shared by most centres, in the concept of community control. Centres have constitutions that outline the procedures for electing community members to boards of directors. The legislation under which the centres operate as City agencies places control of appointment to boards of directors or, as they are referred to in the legislation, management committees or management boards, totally with City Council. The accommodation has been for Council to appoint whomever the centre recommends plus the two aldermen from

the ward in which the centre is located. However, confusion and conflict have emerged from time to time when in the case of Cowan Avenue community residents felt that the board of management appointed by Council was not representative and in the case of Ralph Thornton when the centre acted for all intents and purposes as if the City had no control at all in the appointment of directors.

There is another complication concerning the need for centres to incorporate as charitable organizations for the purposes of giving receipts and receiving grants as organizations autonomous from the City. In the case of Scadding Court it appeared that the management committee was not aware that it was also the board of a charitable organization. The centres' expectation of autonomy and indeed its need for autonomy in regard to their position in the community and its ability to attract funding apart from the City has appeared to be in conflict from time to time with the expectation of the legislation underwhich the centres operate as City agencies.

3. Mixed Management

Another expectation has to do with control but in a more operational sense. It appears that the process creating community centres involved a number of different agreements and what appear to be compromises with other interests.

In the case of the Ralph Thornton Centre, what originally was conceived by the community as a facility run by the community turned into a facility in which the community had relatively minor control - the Library and the City Departments of Property, Buildings and Inspections and Planning and Development all sharing part of the control. This led to all sorts of operational problems and was at the centre of much of the difficulty experienced there; in fact, the By-law itself confused the areas of responsibility between the Property Department and the Committee of Management of the Ralph Thornton Community Centre.

The division of responsibility at Scadding Court among the Library, the City Departments of Property and Parks and Recreation and the management committee of the Scadding Court Community Centre, although not leading to the same type of confusion as existed at Ralph Thornton, seems to have undermined the ability of the director of the Centre to effectively manage it - one of the main operational problems being the fact that maintenance staff are accountable to the Property Department and not the Centre.

4. Role

At Applegrove there was the expectation that the Applegrove Complex would be an integrating instrument generating more community say in the programs of the Parks and Recreation Department and the Board of Education and in co-ordinating the services of agencies serving the Applegrove community. The reality, upon implementation, is that the Applegrove Complex is another agency seeking an identity and like others in the community requires its programs to be co-ordinated and defined.

The difference between expectation and reality and the contradictions and conflicts among expectations has generated confusion and apparently inhibited the development of the community centres; especially as it pertains to the creation of strong management committees with a clear focus of their responsibilities.

Operations

1. Financial Reporting and Control

In the Operations category financial reporting and control was a major problem in at least two centres - Scadding and Ralph Thornton. Scadding developed a new format under the guidance of its interim director and Ralph Thornton used a pre-audit payment system through the City Auditor. It appears that the complexity of book-keeping and financial control in community centres has been underestimated. In addition to the core budget received from the City, there are usually grants from federal or provincial governments, each with its own reporting and recording demands; and program staff retained through proceeds earned from rentals and special fund raising activities. Fringe benefit packages will vary depending on the source of funding for particular staff. Frequently persons retained by the centres had little knowledge of financial control systems. Staff turn-over meant new staff needed to interpret the idiosyncratic system developed by previous staff. More often than not there was not sufficient knowledge among management committee members to assist staff or to exert management committee control over the financial status of the centre.

There is currently pressure to increase the wage grade of the office manager position to attract staff with higher levels of skill. Also the City Auditor continues to offer assistance through his staff to centres requesting it. It would appear that until recently centres have not taken full advantage of City resources in this area. It does not seem possible or perhaps advisable to attempt to standardize financial reporting and control procedures among centres. Nevertheless, it is abundantly

clear from the evidence collected to date that whatever the system it must be one that accurately and consistently allows management committees to know on a frequent basis the actual financial position of their centres.

2. Management Practices

Management practices, job descriptions, supervision and accountability all have emerged as trouble spots in the community centres as they can be in any community or public agency. Understandably much relies on the strength and ability of the directors. Although no procedures have been used by the Implementation Task Force to evaluate individual staff, it would appear that where there has been strong staff leadership operations problems have been minimal. In some cases there have been extensive job descriptions and thoroughly worked out personnel practices, yet because these were not followed or in particular instances not known to staff or management committee members rather severe staffing problems emerged.

3. Recreation Centre/Community Centres-Inappropriate Comparisons

It appears that from the City point of view community centres have been likened to recreation centres. This has created difficulties in developing wage grades that accurately reflect the nature of the work in a community centre. The degree of responsibility and the complexity of the work is greater for the director of a community centre than it is for the Centre Head of a recreation centre. One merely has to look at the mix of funding, the independent management committee and the personnel responsibilities to appreciate the difference. If comparisons are to be made, it would appear to be more appropriate to compare community centres to TANS agencies in terms of level of responsibility and complexity of work expectations.

4. Program Development

Program development is another major operations issue. In the case of Ralph Thornton, 1347 Davenport and Applegrove one of the main questions relate to similarities and differences between community centre programs and those offered by nearby agencies such as recreation centres and TANS agencies. This issue obviously relates to the question of need. These questions do not appear to have been fully or adequately answered to date. This does not mean that need is not present. What it does mean, however, is that agencies have not done a thorough job in interpreting need or indeed knowing the communities well enough to base programs on recognized gaps in programs or on stated preferences of residents.

Ralph Thornton programs for example could really not be supported on the basis that there were no other resources in the community. In fact, it seemed that at times Ralph Thornton modelled its programs on those offered by other agencies. To justify the existence of Ralph Thornton, Council recognized the need for space for community activities and approved recommendations that allowed that space to be co-ordinated by the Ralph Thornton management committee but programming to be provided by existing social and recreational agencies.

At 1347 Davenport there was not the political will to support service located there with Earlscourt and Wallace Emerson being in such close proximity. Yet some would argue that because of the topography of the area, seniors using 1347 could not really make use of the services as the two recreation centres. A similar argument is currently being used to support the creation of services in the Pelham community.

Pelham is in similar proximity to Earlscourt and Wallace Emerson but is surrounded on all sides by major transportation arteries that act as barriers to residents in attempting to use the resources outside the Pelham area.

The St. Lawrence community is similarly separated from the John Innis Recreation Centre and Dixon Hall.

Resources are currently being provided through the work of the City Departments of Parks and Recreation and Planning and Development to assist agencies in using community demographic data and community organization in program development.

Given limited resources, it is important that costs be justified by programs that clearly relate to an identified community need and can be strongly supported on that basis. This is currently one of the major tasks confronting the Applegrove Community Complex. The Complex is located in the same group of structures as a recreation centre and two schools.

5. Physical Facilities

At Applegrove and Ralph Thornton the Physical facilities themselves generate major operations problems.

The entrance to the Applegrove offices is either through a school or the recreation centre after walking a long poorly lighted lane. Applegrove staff itself has no keys that allow it access to its own space. Therefore, if outdoor activities occur at a time when the school is not open, then access is only attained after making enough noise on a window to attract a school custodian. Once inside, however, participants in programs have any number of exits

and entrances to choose from to leave or with the help of friends gain access to the facilities. Obviously control is a major problem and not only generates difficulty in regard to young participants but also causes inter-user problems regarding which agency is responsible for damage or open doors. The long dark laneway, of course, inhibits participation by children or seniors in the evening.

At Ralph Thornton control is also a major problem. There is no control system on the main floor. Access is gained through a side entrance on Queen Street and program space is located in either the basement or on the second floor. There is currently an attempt to gain agreement to have the Library entrance on the ground floor used as the main entrance for everyone entering the building.

6. Management Committees

The role of management committees on the operations side has not been clearly defined in functional terms for many of the centres reviewed. Management committees seemed to be ill-informed or not informed in regard to important finance, programs and personnel matters. Standing committees were uncertain of their function and influence. As a result, where there was no staff leadership there was no leadership.

As described previously, most community centres have constitutions that require management committee members to be elected at an annual meeting from among the members resident in the community. Some constitutions allow for agency representation. All management committees have two aldermen as members; however, the position of the aldermen in this environment is a difficult one when it comes to providing leadership because of the political interpretation that such leadership might be given and the possible negative impact on the community attitude toward the aldermen and the community centre.

In order to overcome these difficulties recommendations have been made to management committees to use ad hoc structures that include representation of experts from the City and other community agencies to develop new and effective systems and to clarify roles.

ACCC has provided good service to its member agencies both as an information exchange and as a source of expert advice.

The community centres in both the short and long term depend upon highly committed volunteers who are willing to serve on management committees and who are willing to learn sufficiently about the centres to make policy decisions in regard to their operation and

to monitor the work of the staff. Without such commitment from the members of the community, the future of community centres will be in jeopardy.

Neighbourhoods Committee

November 19, 1984

IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE MANDATE

Division of Responsibility

The following are the responsibilities outlined in the July 1982 Report of the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services. Each has an accompanying statement in regard to current progress and to delegation of responsibility in the absence of a task force. As in the Recommendation Review, the mandated responsibilities from the Report of the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recereational Services are in indented format with the comment in open format.

1. To build upon the improved interagency co-operation established by the Task Force and provide a focal point for the co-ordination of services and the resolution of problems at an administrative level.

The co-operation established by the Task Force has been on-going as evidenced in the budget approval process and the continuing good relationship among community agencies and City Departments. The question related to this concerns the degree to which such co-operation can continue in the absence of the Implementation Task Force. A prior question of course is: was the Implementation Task Force an essential ingredient in the on-going co-operation or was the spirit established by the Community Task Force in the previous year sufficient to continue without any formal structure? Regardless, good lines of communication are in place among TANS and AOCC agencies and the City; given the current personalities one might expect the relationships to exist in the absence of structure; or, where structure is necessary, the most appropriate organizations might very well be the more long standing ones such as AOCC, TANS and OCASI; or ad hoc specific task oriented configurations.

2. To establish an inter-agency mechanism for monitoring progress on the recommendations made by the Task Force and adopted by Council and to propose appropriate remedial action where implementation difficulties arise.

To the extent that this was necessary, the work has been accomplished during the past eighteen months.

3. To monitor, report and make recommendations on the general distribution of City recreational and community service resources and to specifically establish a means of reviewing proposals for new facility development.

Much of this work has been assumed by the Planning and Development Department. The review process might be best undertaken by the Neighbourhoods Committee through the new policies that are being proposed by the out-going Implementation Task Force.

4. To provide consultative assistance to all City operated and funded agencies with respect to the implementation of required changes.

The consultative process has been implemented by the Executive of the Task Force and by the ad hoc committee system set up by the Task Force. The Head Office of Parks and Recreation is obviously providing the consultation to the City Recreation Centres; for example, the advisory committees and program goal and objective setting and evaluation. It would appear that agencies might best be served by the on-going development of a wide variety of consultation sources such as the City Departments of Parks and Recreation, Planning and Development and Management Services. Moreover, there is the internal resource provided by such bodies and TANS, AOCC, OCASI and such systems as those being developed concerning the funding of Neighbourhood Services. Generally consultation support seems to be available from a number of existing resources and the main responsibility of the Task Force has been to cultivate the process by which these resources might best be used. This approach has been taken and various manuals currently being prepared for agencies could ensure its continuation in the absence of a formal task force structure.

5. To organize the use of non-financial resources and expertise available within Civic Departments and community agencies with respect to such matters as board development, volunteer recruitment, fund-raising and ways of improving responsiveness of programs to special population groups, e.g., ethnic minorities.

There is obviously a continuing need to cultivate the relationship between City Departments and community agencies. The Planning and Development Department has established a relatively well defined demographic data resource for agencies. The computer resources of the City could be used effectively by agencies in program development. This could be a part of the Planning and Development system currently in place. The issues presented in this category are currently very real needs. It is difficult to know whether or not the Implementation Task Force is the most appropriate response to meeting them. The Funding Committee of the Implementation Task Force has determined that assistance in fund raising might best be provided through agencies assisting one another or through such community agencies as the United Way and Social Planning Council or through direct contact with government departments. Given the

over-all resources within the City of Toronto and the initiative of those active in the social service, recreation and community service fields, it does not appear that another agency such as the Implementation Task Force is required or for that matter would be accepted as a credible resource.

6. To provide Assistance to the Grant Review Board with respect to:

   a. Delineation of funding responsibilities between the City and other funding bodies such as Metro.

   b. appropriate transfers between the two-tiered system of recreaton grants.

   c. annual estimates for the overall level of grant support.

The Funding Committee has worked on (a) and (b) and its report outlines the degree to which changes can be made and systems developed between the City, Metro and other funding bodies. (c) will continue as a major task involving co-operation among all agencies, community groups and members of City Council.

7. To develop program evaluation methodologies for use in City-funded agencies.

A process has been developed by the Objective Setting, Reporting and Evaluation Committee. It is intended as a beginning in the on-going search for increasingly effective and cost efficient methods of service. It is clear that this will be an process that will evolve and be improved upon as more data becomes available.

8. To research, develop and make recommendations for appropriate changes to the City's recreation and community service policies and procedures.

It would appear that a more appropriate approach to this issue would be to encourage on-going research with community in-put on the part of the City Departments responsible in these fields. There seems to be sufficient community organization in the field through existing structures for this interest to be focused from time to time as the need becomes apparent.

Beyond these items listed in the Report the Implementation Task Force has from time to time taken on trouble shooting tasks such as the Ralph Thornton Centre, 1347 Daventport and the St. Lawrence

Community Centre. The strategy used involved the establishment of ad hoc committees consisting of representation from City Departments and the community. The process seems to have been relatively successful in marshalling data, encouraging representative participation and providing a broad cross-section of information to assist members of City Council in making difficult decisions. Moreover, it is clear that the Neighbourhoods Committee could beneift from having a definite policy in regard to its approach to these complicated and time consuming community issues and it is on this question that the recommendations of the Implementation Task Force focus.

ANNOTATED APPENDIX

During the course of its work, the Implementation Task Force produced a number of reports and studies. Listed below are the major reports. Copies of these reports can be obtained by contacting Doris Haist, Department of Parks and Recreation, 21st Floor, East Tower, City Hall.

A. Ralph Thornton Community Centre Report

This appendix includes four sections: the preliminary report; the final report to the Neighbourhoods Committee; the planning notes for the implementation of Council's decisions; and correspondence.

The new board and director are in place and the re-organization planning strategy is well underway.

b. 1347 Davenport Community Centre Report

This appendix contains the one report of the Implementation Task Force to the Neighbourhoods Committee and the Budget Review Group.

The recommendation to maintain the Centre as a senior citizens' facility under the jurisdiction of the Wallace Emerson Recreation Centre was not accepted by Council. The matter was referred to Planning and Development for further study.

After much deliberation Council on April 16, 1984 decided that 1347 Davenport be used both as a seniors' and a school day care facility with start-up costs to be paid out of remaining NIP funds.

C. St. Lawrence Community Centre Report

This appendix is the report presented to and approved by Council.

An implementation committee has been established. It is chaired by a community member and has representation from the community and the departments of Parks and Recreation, Planning and Development and Housing.

D. Scadding Court Community Centre Report

This report was prepared for the Board of Scadding Court by Roger Hollander and Paul Zarnke to assist the Centre in developing the criteria for reviewing its operations and management, developing priorities and retaining a new director.

The report was accepted by the Board. A new director was appointed several months ago. There has been noticeable improvement in several areas of Centre's operations and management: such as; financial reporting, staff board relations, community relations and programming.

E. Applegrove Community Complex Report

This appendix contains a draft of the preliminary report of the evaluation and review committee and the 1981 and 1983 reports from the original Community Council that led to formation of the Applegrove Community Complex.

The evaluation and review committee chaired by Denise Mossey of Management Services has met on a regular basis over the past ten months to clarify issues and develop a framework for evaluating the Applegrove Complex and the services that its several component organizations provide.

It is expected that the preliminary report will be finalized by the beginning of May 1984 and will be available from the Management Services Department.

F. Funding Committee Report

All the work of the Funding Committee is included here: the issues that were studied;

the statistical analyses of City General and Recreation grants; new financial reporting and application forms; and category definitions.

As of the writing of this report, there has been little, if any, perceptible impact of this work on the practices in place prior to the establishment of the committee.

The process to transfer the major agencies receiving recreation grants to the Department of Parks and Recreation was well underway before the committee began its proceedings.

G. Objective Setting, Reporting and Evaluation Report

The intent of this report was to set directions in a general sense and provide some practical "helps".

It contains definitions, process strategies and sample forms and questionnaires.

It sets the expectation that funders should be able to receive from agencies seeking finances a clear statement of goals and objectives and the extent to which the agencies have achieved them.

H. Co-ordinator of Volunteers Report

This report was prepared at the request of the Budget Review Group in order that a better understanding of the work of a co-ordinator of Volunteers might be attained.

The 519 Church Street Community Centre was initially used as an example and the resources of the Volunteer Centre of Metropolitan Toronto assisted in placing the information in context.

Since the report was written statistical work-ups have been done on Scadding Court and Centre 55 and these are included in this appendix.

To date this information has not resulted in any increase in funding from the Budget Review Group to finance co ordinator of volunteer positions.

Neighbourhoods Committee

November 19, 1984

I. Neighbourhood and Community Centre Education Project

This section includes a summary of the project, correspondence, lists of people invited to participate and lists of the registrants.

An evaluation is being undertaken by Jim Ward of Dixon Hall and is expected to be available by the end of May. The Dixon Hall "Computers in the Community" program was an essential part of the organization of this project.

Roger Hollander

CHAIRMAN

POOR
QUALITY
ORIGINAL